arXiv:1207.2982v1 [math.NA] 12 Jul 2012

Mean field games: convergence of a finite difference method

Yves Achdou [*], Fabio Camilli [†], Italo Capuzzo-Dolcetta [‡]

July 13, 2012

Abstract

Mean field type models describing the limiting behavior, as the number of players tends to $+\infty$, of stochastic differential game problems, have been recently introduced by J-M. Lasry and P-L. Lions. Numerical methods for the approximation of the stationary and evolutive versions of such models have been proposed by the authors in previous works . Convergence theorems for these methods are proved under various assumptions.

MSC 2000: 65M06,65M12,91-08,91A23,49L25.

Keywords: Mean field games, numerical methods.

1 Introduction

Mean field type models describing the asymptotic behavior of stochastic differential games (Nash equilibria) as the number of players tends to $+\infty$ have recently been introduced by J-M. Lasry and P-L. Lions [14, 15, 16]. They may lead to systems of evolutive partial differential equations involving two unknown scalar functions: the density of the agents in a given state x, namely $m = m(t, x)$ and the potential $u = u(t, x)$. Since the present work is devoted to finite difference schemes, we will assume that the dimension of the state space is $d = 2$ (what follows could be generalized to any dimension d, although in practice, finite difference methods require too many computing resources when $d \geq 4$). In the periodic setting, typical such model comprises the following system of evolution partial differential equations

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(t,x) - \nu\Delta u(t,x) + H(x,\nabla u(t,x)) = \Phi[m(t,\cdot)](x), \qquad \text{in } (0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^2, \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{\partial m}{\partial t}(t,x) + \nu\Delta m(t,x) + \operatorname{div}\left(m(t,\cdot)\frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(\cdot,\nabla u(t,\cdot))\right)(x) = 0, \qquad \text{in } (0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^2, \tag{2}$$

with the initial and terminal conditions

$$u(0,x) = u_0(x), \quad m(T,x) = m_T(x), \quad \text{in } \mathbb{T}^2, \tag{3}$$

given a cost function u_0 and a probability density m_T.
Let us make some comments on the boundary value problem (1)-(3).

---

[*] Univ. Paris Diderot, Sorbonne Paris Cité, Laboratoire Jacques-Louis Lions, UMR 7598, UPMC, CNRS, F-75205 Paris, France. achdou@ljll-univ-paris-diderot.fr

[†] Dipartimento di Metodi e Modelli Matematici per le Scienze Applicate, Università Roma "La Sapienza" Via Antonio Scarpa 16, I-00161 Roma, camilli@dmmm.uniroma1.it

[‡] Dipartimento di Matematica, Università Roma "La Sapienza", Piazzale A. Moro 2, I-00185 Roma, capuzzo@mat.uniroma1.it

First, note that t is the remaining time to the horizon, (the physical time is in fact $T-t$), so u_0 should be seen as a final cost or incitation, whereas m_T is the density of the agents at the beginning of the game.
Here, we denote by $\mathbb{T}^2 = [0,1]^2$ the $2-$dimensional unit torus, by ν a nonnegative constant and by Δ, ∇ and div, respectively, the Laplace, the gradient and the divergence operator acting on the x variable. The system also involves the scalar Hamiltonian $H(x,p)$, which is assumed to be convex with respect to p and $\mathcal{C}^1$ regular w.r.t. x and p. The notation $\frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(x,q)$ is used for the gradient of $p \mapsto H(x,p)$ at $p=q$.
Finally, in the cost term $\Phi[m(t,\cdot)](x)$, Φ may be

- either a local operator, i.e. $\Phi[m(t,\cdot)](x) = F(m(t,x))$ where F is a $\mathcal{C}^1$ regular function defined on $\mathbb{R}_+$. In this case, there are existence theorems of either classical (see [6]) or weak solutions (see [15]), under suitable assumptions on the data, H and F.
- or a non local operator which continuously maps the set of probability measures on $\mathbb{T}^2$ (endowed with the weak * topology) to a bounded subset of $Lip(\mathbb{T}^2)$, the Lipschitz functions on $\mathbb{T}^2$, and for example maps continously $C^{k,\alpha}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ to $C^{k+1,\alpha}(\mathbb{T}^2)$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \le \alpha < 1$. In this case, classical solutions of (1)-(3) are shown to exist under natural assumptions on the data and some technical assumptions on H.

We have chosen to focus on the case when the cost $u_{|t=0}$ depends directly on x. In some realistic situations, the final cost may depend on the density of the players, i.e. $u_{|t=0} = \Phi_0[m_{|t=0}](x)$, where Φ_0 is an operator acting on probability densities, which may be local or not. This case can be handled by the methods presented below, but we will not discuss it in the present work.

System (1)- (2) consists of a forward Bellman equation coupled with a backward Fokker-Planck equation. The forward-backward structure is an important feature of this system, which makes it necessary to design new strategies for its mathematical analysis (see [15, 16]) and for numerical approximation.

The following steady state version of (1)-(3) arises when mean field games with infinite horizon are considered (ergodic problem):

$$-\nu\Delta u(x) + H(x,\nabla u(x)) + \lambda = \Phi[m(\cdot)](x), \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{T}^2, \tag{4}$$

$$-\nu\Delta m(x) - \operatorname{div}\left(m\frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(\cdot,\nabla u)\right)(x) = 0, \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{T}^2. \tag{5}$$

with the additional normalization of u: $\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u = 0$. The unknowns in (4)-(5) are the density m, the function u and the scalar λ.
We refer to the mentioned papers of J-M. Lasry and P-L. Lions for analytical results concerning problems (1)-(3) and (4)-(5) as well as for their interpretation in stochastic game theory. Let us only mention here that a very important feature of the mean field model above is that uniqueness and stability may be obtained under reasonable assumptions, see [14, 15, 16], in contrast with the Nash system describing the individual behavior of each player, for which uniqueness hardly occurs. To be more precise, uniqueness for (1)-(3) is true if Φ is monotonous in the sense that for all probability measures m and $\tilde{m}$ on $\mathbb{T}^2$,

$$\int (\Phi[m](x) - \Phi[\tilde{m}](x))(dm(x) - d\tilde{m}(x)) \le 0 \Rightarrow m = \tilde{m}. \tag{6}$$

Examples of MFG models with applications in economics and social sciences are proposed in [12]. Many important aspects of the mathematical theory developed by J-M. Lasry and P-L.

Lions on MFG are not published in journals or books, but can be found in the videos of the lectures of P-L. Lions at Collège de France: see the web site of Collège de France, [18].
An important research activity is currently going on about approximation procedures of different types of mean field games models, see [13] for a numerical method based on the reformulation of the model as an optimal control problem for the Fokker-Planck equation with an application in economics and [9] for a work on discrete time, finite state space mean field games. We also refer to [10, 11] for a specific constructive approach for quadratic Hamiltonians. Finally, a semi-discrete approximation for a first order mean field games problem has been studied in [5].

In [2] and [1], the authors have proposed and studied finite difference methods basically relying on monotone approximations of the Hamiltonian and on a suitable weak formulation of the Fokker-Planck equation, both for infinite and finite horizon mean field games. These schemes were shown to have several important features:

- existence and uniqueness for the discretized problems can be obtained by similar arguments as those used in the continuous case,
- they are robust when $\nu \to 0$ (the deterministic limit of the models),
- bounds on the solutions (especially on the Lipschitz norm of $u(t, \cdot)$), which are uniform in the grid step, may be proved under reasonable assumptions on the data.

Fast algorithms for solving the discrete nonlinear systems arising in the discrete version of the MFG systems have been proposed in [3]. In the present paper, we would like to discuss the convergence of the schemes proposed in [2] in the reference case when $H(x, p)$ is of the form

$$H(x, p) = \mathcal{H}(x) + |p|^{\beta}, \tag{7}$$

where β is a positive number greater than 1 and $\mathcal{H}$ is a periodic continuous function, under suitable monotony assumptions on the operator Φ. These assumptions lead to uniqueness for both the continuous and discrete system, and also to a priori and stability estimates under further assumptions.
This work is organized as follows: in Section 2, we recall the finite difference schemes proposed in [2, 1]. Section 3 is devoted to basic facts concerning the discrete Hamiltonians and to the fundamental identity which leads to uniqueness and stability. When Φ is a local operator, a consequence of this key identity is the a priori estimates on the solutions of the discrete MFG system that is presented in Section 5.1. Convergence theorems in the case when Φ is a nonlocal smoothing operator are discussed in Section 4. Finally, Section 5 contains convergence theorems in the case when Φ is a local operator.

2 Finite difference schemes

Let N_T be a positive integer and $\Delta t = T/N_T$, $t_n = n\Delta t$, $n = 0, \dots, N_T$. Let $\mathbb{T}_h^2$ be a uniform grid on the torus with mesh step h, (assuming that $1/h$ is an integer N_h), and x_{ij} denote a generic point in $\mathbb{T}_h^2$. The values of u and m at $(x_{i,j}, t_n)$ are respectively approximated by $u_{i,j}^n$ and $m_{i,j}^n$. Let u^n (resp. m^n) be the vector containing the values $u_{i,j}^n$ (resp. $m_{i,j}^n$), for $0 \le i, j < N_h$ indexed in the lexicographic order. For all grid function z on $\mathbb{T}_h^2$, all i and j, we agree that $z_{i,j} = z_{(i \bmod N_h),(j \bmod N_h)}$.

Elementary finite difference operators Let us introduce the elementary finite difference operators

$$(D_1^+ u)_{i,j} = \frac{u_{i+1,j} - u_{i,j}}{h} \quad \text{and} \quad (D_2^+ u)_{i,j} = \frac{u_{i,j+1} - u_{i,j}}{h}, \tag{8}$$

and define $[D_h u]_{i,j}$ as the collection of the four possible one sided finite differences at $x_{i,j}$:

$$[D_h u]_{i,j} = \Big((D_1^+ u)_{i,j}, (D_1^+ u)_{i-1,j}, (D_2^+ u)_{i,j}, (D_2^+ u)_{i,j-1} \Big) \in \mathbb{R}^4. \tag{9}$$

We will also need the standard five point discrete Laplace operator

$$(\Delta_h u)_{i,j} = -\frac{1}{h^2}(4u_{i,j} - u_{i+1,j} - u_{i-1,j} - u_{i,j+1} - u_{i,j-1}).$$

Numerical Hamiltonian In order to approximate the term $H(x, \nabla u)$ in (1) or (4), we consider a numerical Hamiltonian $g : \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^4 \to \mathbb{R}$, $(x, q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4) \mapsto g(x, q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4)$. Hereafter we will often assume that the following conditions hold:

($\mathbf{g_1}$) *monotonicity*: g is nonincreasing with respect to q_1 and q_3 and nondecreasing with respect to q_2 and q_4.

($\mathbf{g_2}$) *consistency:* $g(x, q_1, q_1, q_2, q_2) = H(x, q), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{T}^2, \forall q = (q_1, q_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

($\mathbf{g_3}$) *differentiability*: g is of class $\mathcal{C}^1$.

($\mathbf{g_4}$) *convexity* : $(q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4) \mapsto g(x, q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4)$ is convex.

We will approximate $H(\cdot, \nabla u)(x_{i,j})$ by $g(x_{i,j}, [D_h u]_{i,j})$.
Standard examples of numerical Hamiltonians fulfilling these requirements are provided by Lax-Friedrichs or Godunov type schemes, see [2]. In this work, we focus on Hamiltonians of the form $H(x, p) = \mathcal{H}(x) + |p|^\beta$, for which we choose

$$g(x, q) = \mathcal{H}(x) + G(q_1^-, q_2^+, q_3^-, q_4^+), \tag{10}$$

where, for a real number r, $r^+ = \max(r, 0)$ and $r^- = \max(-r, 0)$ and where $G : (\mathbb{R}_+)^4 \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is given by

$$G(p) = |p|^\beta = (p_1^2 + p_2^2 + p_3^2 + p_4^2)^{\frac{\beta}{2}}. \tag{11}$$

Discrete version of the cost term $\Phi[m(t, \cdot)](x)$ We introduce the compact and convex set

$$\mathcal{K}_h = \{(m_{i,j})_{0 \le i,j < N_h} : h^2 \sum_{i,j} m_{i,j} = 1; \quad m_{i,j} \ge 0\} \tag{12}$$

which can be viewed as the set of the discrete probability measures.
We make the following assumptions, Φ_h being local or not:

(Φ_{h1}) We assume that Φ_h is continuous on $\mathcal{K}_h$.

(Φ_{h2}) The numerical cost Φ_h is monotone in the following sense:

$$(\Phi_h[m] - \Phi_h[\tilde{m}], m - \tilde{m})_2 \le 0 \Rightarrow \Phi_h[m] = \Phi_h[\tilde{m}], \tag{13}$$

where $(u, v)_2 = \sum_{0 \le i,j < N_h} u_{i,j} v_{i,j}$. This assumption and (g_4) will be a sufficient condition for the discrete MFG system to have at most a solution, Φ_h being local or not.

If Φ is a local operator, i.e. $\Phi[m](x) = F(m(x))$, F being a continuous function from $\mathbb{R}^+$ to $\mathbb{R}$, then the discrete version of Φ is naturally given by $(\Phi_h[m])_{i,j} = F(m_{i,j})$. In this case, the operator Φ_h is continuous on the set of nonnegative grid functions.
If Φ is a nonlocal operator, then we assume that the discrete operator Φ_h has the following additional properties:

(Φ_{h3}) We assume that there exists a constant C independent of h such that for all times t and for all grid function $m \in \mathcal{K}_h$,

$$\|\Phi_h[m]\|_\infty \le C \tag{14}$$

and

$$|(\Phi_h[m])_{i,j} - (\Phi_h[m])_{k,\ell}| \le C d_{\mathbb{T}}(x_{i,j}, x_{k,\ell}) \tag{15}$$

where $d_{\mathbb{T}}(x,y)$ is the distance between the two points x and y in the torus $\mathbb{T}^2$.

(Φ_{h4}) Define $\mathcal{K}$ as the set of probability densities, i.e. nonnegative integrable functions m on $\mathbb{T}^2$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} m(x)dx = 1$. For a grid function $m_h \in \mathcal{K}_h$, let $\tilde{m}_h$ be the piecewise bilinear interpolation of m_h at the grid nodes: it is clear that $\tilde{m}_h \in \mathcal{K}$. We assume that there exists a continuous and bounded function $\omega : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\omega(0) = 0$ and for all $m \in \mathcal{K}$, for all sequences $(m_h)_h$, $m_h \in \mathcal{K}_h$,

$$\| \Phi[m] - \Phi_h[m_h] \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}_h^2)} \le \omega\left(\|m - \tilde{m}_h\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^2)}\right). \tag{16}$$

Let $\mathcal{I}_h m$ be the grid function whose value at $x_{i,j}$ is

$$\int_{|x-x_{i,j}|_\infty \le h/2} m(x)dx.$$

It is clear that if $m \in \mathcal{K}$ then $\mathcal{I}_h m \in \mathcal{K}_h$ and that (16) implies that

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \sup_{m\in\mathcal{K}} \| \Phi[m] - \Phi_h[\mathcal{I}_h m] \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}_h^2)} = 0. \tag{17}$$

For example, if $\Phi[m]$ is defined as the solution w of the equation $\Delta^2 w + w = m$ in $\mathbb{T}^2$, (Δ^2 being the bilaplacian), then one can define $\Phi_h[m_h]$ as the solution w_h of $\Delta_h^2 w_h + w_h = m_h$ in $\mathbb{T}_h^2$. It is possible to check that all the above properties are true.

Discrete Bellman equation The discrete version of the Bellman equation is obtained by applying a semi-implicit Euler scheme to (1),

$$\frac{u_{i,j}^{n+1} - u_{i,j}^n}{\Delta t} - \nu(\Delta_h u^{n+1})_{i,j} + g(x_{i,j}, [D_h u^{n+1}]_{i,j}) = (\Phi_h[m^n])_{i,j}, \tag{18}$$

for all points in $\mathbb{T}_h^2$ and all n, $0 \le n < N_T$, where all the discrete operators have been introduced above. Given $(m^n)_{n=0,\dots,N_T-1}$, (18) and the initial condition $u_{i,j}^0 = u_0(x_{i,j})$ for all (i,j) completely characterizes $(u^n)_{0\le n\le N_T}$.

Discrete Fokker-Planck equation In order to approximate equation (2), it is convenient to consider its weak formulation which involves in particular the term

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} \operatorname{div}\left(m\frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(\cdot, \nabla u)\right)(x) w(x)\, dx.$$

By periodicity,

$$-\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} m(x)\frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(x,\nabla u(x))\cdot\nabla w(x)\,dx$$

holds for any test function w. The right hand side in the identity above will be approximated by

$$-h^2\sum_{i,j} m_{i,j}\nabla_q g(x_{i,j},[D_h u]_{i,j})\cdot[D_h w]_{i,j} = h^2\sum_{i,j}\mathcal{T}_{i,j}(u,m)w_{i,j},$$

where the transport operator $\mathcal{T}$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{T}_{i,j}(u,m) = \frac{1}{h}\left(\begin{array}{l}\left(\begin{array}{l} m_{i,j}\frac{\partial g}{\partial q_1}(x_{i,j},[D_h u]_{i,j}) - m_{i-1,j}\frac{\partial g}{\partial q_1}(x_{i-1,j},[D_h u]_{i-1,j}) \\ +m_{i+1,j}\frac{\partial g}{\partial q_2}(x_{i+1,j},[D_h u]_{i+1,j}) - m_{i,j}\frac{\partial g}{\partial q_2}(x_{i,j},[D_h u]_{i,j})\end{array}\right) \\ \\ +\left(\begin{array}{l} m_{i,j}\frac{\partial g}{\partial q_3}(x_{i,j},[D_h u]_{i,j}) - m_{i,j-1}\frac{\partial g}{\partial q_3}(x_{i,j-1},[D_h u]_{i,j-1}) \\ +m_{i,j+1}\frac{\partial g}{\partial q_4}(x_{i,j+1},[D_h u]_{i,j+1}) - m_{i,j}\frac{\partial g}{\partial q_4}(x_{i,j},[D_h u]_{i,j})\end{array}\right)\end{array}\right). \tag{19}$$

The discrete version of equation (2) is chosen as follows:

$$\frac{m_{i,j}^{n+1}-m_{i,j}^n}{\Delta t} + \nu(\Delta_h m^n)_{i,j} + \mathcal{T}_{i,j}(u^{n+1},m^n) = 0. \tag{20}$$

This scheme is implicit w.r.t. to m and explicit w.r.t. u because the considered Fokker-Planck equation is backward. Given u this is a system of linear equations for m. It is easy to see that if m^n satisfies (20) for $0\le n<N_T$ and if $m^{N_T}\in\mathcal{K}_h$, then $m^n\in\mathcal{K}_h$ for all n, $0\le n<N_T$.

Remark 1 *It is important to realize that the operator* $m\mapsto\big(-\nu(\Delta_h m)_{i,j}-\mathcal{T}_{i,j}(u,m)\big)_{i,j}$ *is the adjoint of the linearized version of the operator* $u\mapsto\big(-\nu(\Delta_h u)_{i,j}+g(x_{i,j},[D_h u]_{i,j})\big)_{i,j}$.

Summary The fully discrete scheme for system (1),(2),(3) is therefore the following: for all $0\le i,j<N_h$ and $0\le n<N_T$

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll}\frac{u_{i,j}^{n+1}-u_{i,j}^n}{\Delta t} - \nu(\Delta_h u^{n+1})_{i,j} + g(x_{i,j},[D_h u^{n+1}]_{i,j}) & = (\Phi_h[m^n])_{i,j}), \\ \frac{m_{i,j}^{n+1}-m_{i,j}^n}{\Delta t} + \nu(\Delta_h m^n)_{i,j} + \mathcal{T}_{i,j}(u^{n+1},m^n) & = 0,\end{array}\right. \tag{21}$$

with the initial and terminal conditions

$$m_{i,j}^{N_T} = \frac{1}{h^2}\int_{|x-x_{i,j}|_\infty\le h/2} m_T(x)dx, \qquad u_{i,j}^0 = u_0(x_{i,j}), \quad 0\le i,j<N_h. \tag{22}$$

The following theorem was proved in [2] (using essentially a Brouwer fixed point argument and estimates on the solutions of the discrete Bellman equation):

Theorem 1 *Assume that* $\nu>0$, *that* (g_1)*–*(g_3) *and* (Φ_{h1}) *hold, that* u_0 *is a continuous function on* $\mathbb{T}^2$ *and that* $m_T\in\mathcal{K}$*: then (21)–(22) has a solution such that* $m^n\in\mathcal{K}_h$, $\forall n$.
If furthermore

- (Φ_{h3}) *holds*

- *there exists a constant C such that*

$$\left|\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}(x,(q_1,q_2,q_3,q_4))\right| \le C(1+|q_1|+|q_2|+|q_3|+|q_4|) \quad \forall x\in\mathbb{T}^2,\, \forall q_1,q_2,q_3,q_4$$

- *u_0 is Lipschitz continuous*

then $\max_{0\le n\le N_T}\left(\|u^n\|_\infty + \|D_h u^n\|_\infty\right)\le c$ *for a constant c independent of h and Δt.*

Remark 2 *Note that the technical condition on $\frac{\partial g}{\partial x}$ is automatically true if g is given by (10)-(11) and h is $\mathcal{C}^1$.*

Remark 3 *A priori estimates in the case when Φ is a local operator will be given in § 5.1.*

Since (21)-(22) has exactly the same structure as the continuous problem (1)-(3), uniqueness has been obtained in [2] with the same arguments as in [15]:

Theorem 2 *Assume that $\nu>0$, that (g_1)–(g_4) and (Φ_{h1})-(Φ_{h2}) hold, then (21)–(22) has a unique solution.*

3 Basic facts for numerical Hamiltonians of the form (10)-(11)

We focus on numerical Hamitonians in the form (10)-(11) but obviously, what follows holds for $g(x,q)=\mathcal{H}(x)+cG(q)$, where G is given by (11) and c is a positive constant.
We use the following notations: for $p\in\mathbb{R}^4$, $|p|$ (resp. $|p|_\infty$) is the Euclidean norm of p (resp. the max norm: $|p|_\infty=\max_{i=1,\dots,4}|p_i|$). For a function $p\to\psi(p)\in\mathbb{R}$, $p\in\mathbb{R}^4$, $\psi_p(p)\in\mathbb{R}^4$ (resp. $\psi_{pp}(p)\in\mathbb{R}^{4\times4}$) will stand for the gradient of ψ (resp. the Hessian of ψ). For a function $(x,p)\to\psi(x,p)\in\mathbb{R}$, $x\in\mathbb{T}_2$, $p\in\mathbb{R}^4$, $\psi_p(x,p)\in\mathbb{R}^4$ is the gradient of $p\to\psi(x,p)$ and $\psi_{pp}(x,p)\in\mathbb{R}^{4\times4}$ is the Hessian of $p\to\psi(x,p)$.

3.1 Basic lemmas

Let us state a few lemmas about g and G:

Lemma 1 *For all $p\in(\mathbb{R}_+)^4$, $G_p(p)=\beta|p|^{\beta-2}p$ and*

$$G_{pp}(p)=\beta|p|^{\beta-2}I_4+\beta(\beta-2)|p|^{\beta-4}p\otimes p. \tag{23}$$

If $\beta\ge2$, then $G_{pp}(p)-\beta|p|^{\beta-2}I_4$ is a positive semi-definite matrix, which may be written

$$G_{pp}(p)\ge\beta|p|^{\beta-2}I_4. \tag{24}$$

If $1<\beta<2$, then

$$G_{pp}(p)\ge\beta(\beta-1)|p|^{\beta-2}I_4. \tag{25}$$

Lemma 2 *For all $q,\tilde q\in\mathbb{R}^4$, let $p,\tilde p\in(\mathbb{R}_+)^4$ be given by*

$$p=(q_1^-,q_2^+,q_3^-,q_4^+),\quad \text{and}\quad \tilde p=(\tilde q_1^-,\tilde q_2^+,\tilde q_3^-,\tilde q_4^+). \tag{26}$$

We have that

$$g(x,\tilde q)-g(x,q)-g_q(x,q)\cdot(\tilde q-q)\ge G(\tilde p)-G(p)-G_p(p)\cdot(\tilde p-p). \tag{27}$$

Proof. See Appendix A. ■

Lemma 3 *If $\beta \geq 2$, then for all $q, \tilde{q} \in \mathbb{R}^4$, for $p, \tilde{p} \in (\mathbb{R}_+)^4$ given by (26)*

$$\begin{aligned} g(x,\tilde{q}) - g(x,q) - g_q(x,q)\cdot(\tilde{q}-q) &\geq \frac{1}{\beta-1}\max(|p|^{\beta-2}, |\tilde{p}|^{\beta-2})|p-\tilde{p}|^2 && (28)\\ &\geq \frac{|p-\tilde{p}|^\beta}{2^{\beta-2}(\beta-1)}. && (29)\end{aligned}$$

If $1 < \beta < 2$, then for all $q, \tilde{q} \in \mathbb{R}^4$ such that for $p, \tilde{p}$ given by (26), $\tilde{p} + p \neq 0$, we have

$$g(x,\tilde{q}) - g(x,q) - g_q(x,q)\cdot(\tilde{q}-q) \geq 2^{\beta-3}\beta(\beta-1)\min(|p|_\infty^{\beta-2}, |\tilde{p}|_\infty^{\beta-2})|p-\tilde{p}|^2. \quad (30)$$

Proof. See Appendix A. ■

Lemma 4 *For $\beta \geq 2$, there exists a positive constant c such that for all $q, \tilde{q}, r \in \mathbb{R}^4$, for all $\eta > 0$,*

$$|(g_q(x,\tilde{q}) - g_q(x,q))\cdot r| \leq \max(|p|^{\beta-2}, |\tilde{p}|^{\beta-2})\left(\frac{c}{\eta}|p-\tilde{p}|^2 + \eta|r|^2\right). \quad (31)$$

where $p, \tilde{p} \in (\mathbb{R}_+)^4$ are given by (26).

Proof. See Appendix A. ■

3.2 A nonlinear functional $\mathcal{G}(m, u, \tilde{u})$

Let us define the nonlinear functional $\mathcal{G}$ acting on grid functions by

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{G}(m,u,\tilde{u})\\ =&\sum_{n=1}^{N_T}\sum_{i,j} m_{i,j}^{n-1}\Big(g(x_{i,j},[D\tilde{u}^n]_{i,j}) - g(x_{i,j},[Du^n]_{i,j}) - g_q(x_{i,j},[Du^n]_{i,j})\cdot([D\tilde{u}^n]_{i,j} - [Du^n]_{i,j})\Big).\end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Under Assumption (g_4), it is clear that $\mathcal{G}(m,u,\tilde{u}) \geq 0$ if m is a nonnegative grid function. If g is of the form (10)-(11), we have a more precise estimate:

Lemma 5 *If m is a nonnegative grid function and if g is of the form (10)-(11) with $\beta \geq 2$, then*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G}(m,u,\tilde{u}) &\geq \frac{1}{\beta-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N_T}\sum_{i,j} m_{i,j}^{n-1}\max(|p_{i,j}^n|^{\beta-2}, |\tilde{p}_{i,j}^n|^{\beta-2})|p_{i,j}^n - \tilde{p}_{i,j}^n|^2\\ &\geq \frac{1}{2^{\beta-2}(\beta-1)}\sum_{n=1}^{N_T}\sum_{i,j} m_{i,j}^{n-1}|p_{i,j}^n - \tilde{p}_{i,j}^n|^\beta.\end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where $p_{i,j}^n$ and $\tilde{p}_{i,j}^n$ are the four dimensional vectors

$$\begin{aligned} p_{i,j}^n &= \left(\left((D_1^+u^n)_{i,j}\right)^-, \left((D_1^+u^n)_{i-1,j}\right)^+, \left((D_2^+u^n)_{i,j}\right)^-, \left((D_2^+u^n)_{i,j-1}\right)^+\right),\\ \tilde{p}_{i,j}^n &= \left(\left((D_1^+\tilde{u}^n)_{i,j}\right)^-, \left((D_1^+\tilde{u}^n)_{i-1,j}\right)^+, \left((D_2^+\tilde{u}^n)_{i,j}\right)^-, \left((D_2^+\tilde{u}^n)_{i,j-1}\right)^+\right).\end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Furthermore, if m is bounded from below by $\underline{m}$, then

$$\mathcal{G}(m,u,\tilde{u}) \geq \frac{\underline{m}}{2^{2\beta-3}(\beta-1)}\sum_{n=1}^{N_T}\sum_{i,j}\Big|[D\tilde{u}^n]_{i,j} - [Du^n]_{i,j}\Big|^\beta. \quad (35)$$

Proof. We deduce (33) from (28) and (29). If m is bounded from below by $\underline{m} > 0$, we deduce that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}(m,u,\tilde u) &\geq \frac{\underline{m}}{2^{\beta-2}(\beta-1)} \sum_{n=1}^{N_T} \sum_{i,j} |p^n_{i,j} - \tilde p^n_{i,j}|^\beta \\
&\geq \frac{\underline{m}}{2^{\beta-2}(\beta-1)} \sum_{n=1}^{N_T} \sum_{i,j} \sum_{k=1}^{4} |(p^n_{i,j})_k - (\tilde p^n_{i,j})_k|^\beta .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since for each $0 \leq i,j < N_h$, each $1 \leq k \leq 4$, the quantity $\left|([D\tilde u^n]_{i,j})_k - ([Du^n]_{i,j})_k\right|^\beta$ appears at least once in the sum above, we deduce that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}(m,u,\tilde u) &\geq \frac{\underline{m}}{2^{\beta-1}(\beta-1)} \sum_{n=1}^{N_T} \sum_{i,j} \sum_{k=1}^{4} \left|([D\tilde u^n]_{i,j})_k - ([Du^n]_{i,j})_k\right|^\beta \\
&\geq \frac{\underline{m}}{2^{2\beta-3}(\beta-1)} \sum_{n=1}^{N_T} \sum_{i,j} \left|[D\tilde u^n]_{i,j} - [Du^n]_{i,j}\right|^\beta
\end{aligned}
$$

where the second inequality comes from the fact that for four positive numbers $(a_k)_{k=1,\dots,4}$ $\sum_{k=1}^4 a_k^\beta \geq \frac{1}{4^{\beta/2-1}} (\sum_{k=1}^4 a_k^2)^{\beta/2}$. ■

Remark 4 *The same kind of argument shows that if* $1 < \beta < 2$*, and* $m^n_{i,j} \geq \underline{m}$*, then*

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}(m,0,u) &\geq 2^{\beta-3}\beta(\beta-1)\underline{m} \sum_{n=1}^{N_T} \sum_{i,j} |p^n_{i,j}|_\infty^{\beta-2} |p^n_{i,j}|^2 \geq 2^{\beta-3}\beta(\beta-1)\underline{m} \sum_{n=1}^{N_T} \sum_{i,j} |p^n_{i,j}|^\beta \\
&\geq 2^{2\beta-5}\beta(\beta-1)\underline{m} \sum_{n=1}^{N_T} \sum_{i,j} \sum_{k=1}^{4} |(p^n_{i,j})_k|^\beta \geq 2^{2\beta-6}\beta(\beta-1)\underline{m} \sum_{n=1}^{N_T} \sum_{i,j} \sum_{k=1}^{4} |([Du^n]_{i,j})_k|^\beta \\
&\geq 2^{2\beta-6}\beta(\beta-1)\underline{m} \sum_{n=1}^{N_T} \sum_{i,j} |[Du^n]_{i,j}|^\beta ,
\end{aligned}
$$

where $p^n_{i,j}$ *is given by (34).*

3.3 A fundamental identity

In this paragraph, we discuss a key identity which leads to the stability of the finite difference scheme under additional assumptions. Consider a perturbed system:

$$
\left\{
\begin{array}{ll}
\frac{\tilde u^{n+1}_{i,j} - \tilde u^n_{i,j}}{\Delta t} - \nu(\Delta_h \tilde u^{n+1})_{i,j} + g(x_{i,j}, [D_h \tilde u^{n+1}]_{i,j}) & = (\Phi_h[\tilde m^n])_{i,j} + a^n_{i,j}, \\
\frac{\tilde m^{n+1}_{i,j} - \tilde m^n_{i,j}}{\Delta t} + \nu(\Delta_h \tilde m^n)_{i,j} + \mathcal{T}_{i,j}(\tilde u^{n+1}, \tilde m^n) & = b^n_{i,j}.
\end{array}
\right.
\tag{36}
$$

Multiplying the first equations in (36) and (21) by $m_{i,j}^n - \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n$ and subtracting, then summing the results for all $n = 0, \dots, N_T - 1$ and all (i, j), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} \frac{1}{\Delta t}((u^{n+1} - \tilde{u}^{n+1}) - (u^n - \tilde{u}^n), (m^n - \tilde{m}^n))_2 - \nu(\Delta_h(u^{n+1} - \tilde{u}^{n+1}), m^n - \tilde{m}^n)_2 \\ & + \sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} \sum_{i,j} (g(x_{i,j}, [D_h u^{n+1}]_{i,j}) - g(x_{i,j}, [D_h \tilde{u}^{n+1}]_{i,j}))(m_{i,j}^n - \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n) \\ = & \sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} (\Phi_h[m^n] - \Phi_h[\tilde{m}^n], m^n - \tilde{m}^n)_2 - \sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} (a^n, m^n - \tilde{m}^n)_2, \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

where $(X, Y)_2 = \sum_{i,j} X_{i,j} Y_{i,j}$. Similarly, subtracting the second equation in (36) from the second equation in (20), multiplying the result by $u_{i,j}^{n+1} - \tilde{u}_{i,j}^{n+1}$ and summing for all $n = 0, \dots, N_T - 1$ and all (i, j) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} \frac{1}{\Delta t}((m^{n+1} - m^n) - (\tilde{m}^{n+1} - \tilde{m}^n), (u^{n+1} - \tilde{u}^{n+1}))_2 + \nu((m^n - \tilde{m}^n), \Delta_h(u^{n+1} - \tilde{u}^{n+1}))_2 \\ & - \sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} \sum_{i,j} m_{i,j}^n [D_h(u^{n+1} - \tilde{u}^{n+1})]_{i,j} \cdot g_q\left(x_{i,j}, [D_h u^{n+1}]_{i,j}\right) \\ & + \sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} \sum_{i,j} \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n [D_h(u^{n+1} - \tilde{u}^{n+1})]_{i,j} \cdot g_g\left(x_{i,j}, [D_h \tilde{u}^{n+1}]_{i,j}\right) = -\sum_{n=1}^{N_T} (b^{n-1}, u^n - \tilde{u}^n)_2. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Adding (37) and (38) leads to the fundamental identity

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{\Delta t}(m^{N_T} - \tilde{m}^{N_T}, u^{N_T} - \tilde{u}^{N_T})_2 + \frac{1}{\Delta t}(m^0 - \tilde{m}^0, u^0 - \tilde{u}^0)_2 \\ & + \mathcal{G}(m, u, \tilde{u}) + \mathcal{G}(\tilde{m}, \tilde{u}, u) + \sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} (\Phi_h[m^n] - \Phi_h[\tilde{m}^n], m^n - \tilde{m}^n)_2 \\ = & \sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} (a^n, m^n - \tilde{m}^n)_2 + \sum_{n=1}^{N_T} (b^{n-1}, u^n - \tilde{u}^n)_2. \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

It is important to note that under assumptions (g_4) and (Φ_{h2}), the second line of (39) is made of three nonnegative terms. This is the key observation leading to uniqueness for (21)-(22), but it may also lead to a priori estimates or stability estimates under additional assumptions including for example the assumptions of Lemma 5.

4 Study of the convergence in the case when Φ is a nonlocal smoothing operator

Hereafter the Hamiltonian is of the form (7). In all the following convergence results, we assume that system (1)-(3) has a unique classical solution. This is always the case if Φ is monotonous in the sense of (6) and continuously maps the set of probability measures on $\mathbb{T}^2$ (endowed with the weak * topology) to a bounded subset of $Lip(\mathbb{T}^2)$, the Lipschitz functions on $\mathbb{T}^2$, and for example maps continously $C^{k,\alpha}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ to $C^{k+1,\alpha}(\mathbb{T}^2)$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \le \alpha < 1$.
We summarize the assumptions made in § 4 as follows:

Standing assumptions (in Section 4)

- We take $\nu > 0$
- The Hamiltonian is of the form (7) and the function $x \to \mathcal{H}(x)$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$ on $\mathbb{T}^2$
- the functions u^0 and m_T are smooth, and $m_T \in \mathcal{K}$ is bounded from below by a positive number
- We assume that Φ is monotone in the sense of (6), nonlocal and smoothing, so that there is a unique classical solution (u, m) of (1)-(3) such that $m > 0$
- We consider a numerical Hamiltonian given by (10)-(11) and a numerical cost function Φ_h such that (Φ_{h1}), (Φ_{h2}), (Φ_{h3}), and (Φ_{h4}) hold.

4.1 The case when $\beta \geq 2$

Theorem 3 *We make the standing assumptions stated at the beginning of § 4 and we choose* $\beta \geq 2$.
Let u_h *(resp.* m_h*) be the piecewise trilinear function in* $\mathcal{C}([0,T]\times\mathbb{T}^2)$ *obtained by interpolating the values* $u^n_{i,j}$ *(resp* $m^n_{i,j}$*) at the nodes of the space-time grid. The functions* u_h *converge uniformly and in* $L^\beta(0,T; W^{1,\beta}(\mathbb{T}^2))$ *to* u *as* h *and* Δt *tend to* 0*. The functions* m_h *converge to* m *in* $C^0([0,T]; L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)) \cap L^2(0,T; H^1(\mathbb{T}^2))$ *as* h *and* Δt *tend to* 0.

Proof. Note that $m_h(t,\cdot) \in \mathcal{K}$ for any $t \in [0,T]$.
We call $\tilde u^n$ and $\tilde m^n$ the grid functions such that $\tilde u^n_{i,j} = u(n\Delta t, x_{i,j})$ and $\tilde m^n = \mathcal{I}_h(m(t_n,\cdot))$. The functions $\tilde u^n$ and $\tilde m^n$ are solutions of (36) where a and b are consistency errors. From the fact that (u,m) is a classical solution of (1)-(3), we infer from the consistency of the scheme (in particular from (17)) that $\max_{0\le n<N_T}(\|a^n\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}_h^2)} + \|b^n\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}_h^2)})$ tends to zero as h and Δt tend to zero.

Step 1 As a consequence of the previous observations, the fundamental identity (39) holds, and from (22), can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &h^2\Delta t\mathcal{G}(m,u,\tilde u) + h^2\Delta t\mathcal{G}(\tilde m,\tilde u,u) + h^2\Delta t\sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1}(\Phi_h[m^n]-\Phi_h[\tilde m^n], m^n-\tilde m^n)_2\\ =&h^2\Delta t\sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1}(a^n, m^n-\tilde m^n)_2 + h^2\Delta t\sum_{n=1}^{N_T}(b^{n-1}, u^n-\tilde u^n)_2. \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

The a priori estimate on the discrete Lipschitz norm of u_h given at the end of Theorem 1 implies that $\lim_{h,\Delta t\to 0} h^2\max_n |(b^{n-1}, u^n-\tilde u^n)_2| = 0$. From the fact that $m^n \in \mathcal{K}_h$, we also get that $\lim_{h,\Delta t\to 0} h^2\max_n |(a^n, m^n-\tilde m^n)_2| = 0$. We can then use (33) to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta t\, h^2\sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1}\sum_{i,j}\tilde m^n_{i,j}\max\left(|p^{n+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2}, |\tilde p^{n+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2}\right)|p^{n+1}_{i,j}-\tilde p^{n+1}_{i,j}|^2 &= o(1),\\ \Delta t\, h^2\sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1}\sum_{i,j} m^n_{i,j}\max\left(|p^{n+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2}, |\tilde p^{n+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2}\right)|p^{n+1}_{i,j}-\tilde p^{n+1}_{i,j}|^2 &= o(1). \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

where $p^n_{i,j}$ and $\tilde{p}^n_{i,j}$ are given by (34). Since $\tilde{m}^n_{i,j}$ is bounded from below by a positive constant, we also deduce from (35) that

$$h^2\Delta t\sum_{n=1}^{N_T}\sum_{i,j}\left|[D_h\tilde{u}^n]_{i,j}-[D_hu^n]_{i,j}\right|^\beta=o(1). \tag{42}$$

Step 2 We introduce $e^\ell=m^\ell-\tilde{m}^\ell$. Subtracting the second equation in (36) from the second equation in (21), multiplying the result by $e^\ell_{i,j}$ and summing for all $\ell=0,\dots,n-1$ and all (i,j) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&h^2\sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1}(e^{\ell+1}-e^\ell,e^\ell)_2+\Delta t\,h^2\sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1}\nu(\Delta_he^\ell,e^\ell)_2\\
&-\Delta t\,h^2\sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1}\sum_{i,j}[D_he^\ell]_{i,j}\cdot\Big(m^\ell_{i,j}g_q(x_{i,j},[D_hu^{\ell+1}]_{i,j})-\tilde{m}^\ell_{i,j}g_q(x_{i,j},[D_h\tilde{u}^{\ell+1}]^{\ell+1}_{i,j})\Big)\\
=&-h^2\Delta t\sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1}(b^\ell,e^\ell)_2.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta t\,h^2\sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1}\left(\frac{1}{\Delta t}(e^{\ell+1}-e^\ell,e^\ell)_2+\nu(\Delta_he^\ell,e^\ell)_2-\sum_{i,j}e^\ell_{i,j}[D_he^\ell]_{i,j}\cdot g_q(x_{i,j},[D_hu^{\ell+1}]_{i,j})\right)\\
=&-h^2\Delta t\sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1}(b^\ell,e^\ell)_2-\Delta t\,h^2\sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1}\sum_{i,j}\tilde{m}^\ell_{i,j}[D_he^\ell]_{i,j}\cdot(g_q(x_{i,j},[D_h\tilde{u}^{\ell+1}]_{i,j})-g_q(x_{i,j},[D_hu^{\ell+1}]_{i,j})).
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

It is clear that

$$h^2\Delta t\left|\sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1}(b^\ell,e^\ell)_2\right|=o(1)\left(h^2\Delta t\sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1}\|e^\ell\|_2^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

From Lemma 4, we know that there exists an absolute constant c such that for all $\eta>0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\tilde{m}^\ell_{i,j}[D_he^\ell]_{i,j}\cdot(g_q(x_{i,j},[D_h\tilde{u}^{\ell+1}]_{i,j})-g_q(x_{i,j},[D_hu^{\ell+1}]_{i,j})\right|\\
\leq\;&\tilde{m}^\ell_{i,j}\max(|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2},|\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2})\left(\frac{c}{\eta}|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}-\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^2+\eta|[D_he^\ell]_{i,j}|^2\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where $p^{\ell+1}_{i,j},\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}\in(\mathbb{R}_+)^4$ are given by (34). Using the L^∞ bound on $[D_hu^{\ell+1}]$ uniform w.r.t. ℓ, h and Δt given in Theorem 1, we obtain that there exists a constant c such that for all $\eta>0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\tilde{m}^\ell_{i,j}[D_he^\ell]_{i,j}\cdot(g_q(x_{i,j},[D_h\tilde{u}^{\ell+1}]_{i,j})-g_q(x_{i,j},[D_hu^{\ell+1}]_{i,j})\right|\\
\leq&\tilde{m}^\ell_{i,j}\left(\frac{c}{\eta}\left|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}-\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}\right|^\beta+\eta|[D_he^\ell]_{i,j}|^2\right)\\
\leq&\tilde{m}^\ell_{i,j}\left(\frac{c}{\eta}\left|[D_hu^{\ell+1}]_{i,j}-[D_h\tilde{u}^{\ell+1}]_{i,j}\right|^\beta+\eta|[D_he^\ell]_{i,j}|^2\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

We shall also use the standard estimate :

$$\left\|[D_h e^\ell]\right\|_2^2 \leq -C(\Delta_h e^\ell, e^\ell)_2, \tag{45}$$

for a positive constant C independent of h. Finally, from (43), a very classical argument making use of (44), (45) and (42), the L^∞ bound on $[D_h u^{\ell+1}]$ uniform w.r.t. ℓ, h and Δt, and the fact that $h\|e^{N_T}\|_2 = o(1)$, leads to the estimate:

$$\max_{0\leq \ell < N_T} h^2\|e^\ell\|_2^2 + \Delta t\, h^2 \sum_{\ell=0}^{N_T-1} \left\|[D_h e^\ell]\right\|_2^2 = o(1). \tag{46}$$

We easily deduce from (46) the claim on the convergence of m_h to m.

Step 3 We have found that $\max_{0\leq \ell<N_T} h^2\|m^\ell - \mathcal{I}_h(m(t_\ell,\cdot))\|_2^2 = o(1)$. From (Φ_{h4}), this implies that

$$\frac{u^{n+1}_{i,j} - u^n_{i,j}}{\Delta t} - \nu(\Delta_h u^{n+1})_{i,j} + g(x_{i,j}, [D_h u^{n+1}]_{i,j}) = (\Phi[m(t_{n+1},\cdot)])(x_{i,j}) + o(1),$$

The uniform convergence of the piecewise linear functions u_h (defined by interpolating the values $u^n_{i,j}$) to u is obtained from classical results on the approximation of Bellman equations by consistent and monotone schemes. From this and (42), we also deduce the convergence of u_h to u in $L^\beta(0,T;W^{1,\beta}(\mathbb{T}^2))$. ∎

Remark 5 *In the present case, additional assumptions on the order of the discrete scheme should lead to error estimates. We will not discuss this matter.*

4.2 The case when $1 < \beta < 2$

Theorem 4 *We make the standing assumptions stated at the beginning of § 4 and we choose* β *such* $1 < \beta < 2$.
Let u_h *(resp.* m_h*) be the piecewise trilinear function in* $\mathcal{C}([0,T]\times\mathbb{T}^2)$ *obtained by interpolating the values* $u^n_{i,j}$ *(resp* $m^n_{i,j}$*) at the nodes of the space-time grid. The functions* u_h *converge uniformly and in* $L^2(0,T;W^{1,2}(\mathbb{T}^2))$ *to* u *as* h *and* Δt *tend to* 0. *The functions* m_h *converge to* m *in* $L^2((0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^2)$ *as* h *and* Δt *tend to* 0.

Proof.

Step 1 We start from (40) where a and b are the same consistency errors (with the same bounds) as in the previous paragraph; using (30), this implies that

$$2^{\beta-3}\beta(\beta-1)\Delta t\, h^2 \sum_{\ell=0}^{N_T-1}\sum_{i,j} \tilde m^\ell_{i,j} 1_{\{p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}+\tilde p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}\neq 0\}} \min\left(|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|_\infty^{\beta-2}, |\tilde p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|_\infty^{\beta-2}\right) |p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^2 = o(1). \tag{47}$$

where $p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}, \tilde p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} \in (\mathbb{R}_+)^4$ are given by (34). From the a priori estimates on $\left\|[Du^{\ell+1}]\right\|_\infty$ and $\|[D\tilde u^{\ell+1}]\|_\infty$, the inequalities $1<\beta<2$ and the bound from below on m, there exists a positive constant c such that

$$\tilde m^\ell_{i,j} \min\left(|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|_\infty^{\beta-2}, |\tilde p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|_\infty^{\beta-2}\right) \geq c.$$

Hence

$$\Delta t\, h^2 \sum_{\ell=0}^{N_T-1} \sum_{i,j} |p_{i,j}^{\ell+1} - \tilde{p}_{i,j}^{\ell+1}|^2 = o(1). \tag{48}$$

It is easy to see from the periodicity that (48) implies

$$\Delta t\, h^2 \sum_{\ell=0}^{N_T-1} \sum_{i,j} \left| [D_h u^{\ell+1}]_{i,j} - [D_h \tilde{u}^{\ell+1}]_{i,j} \right|^2 = o(1). \tag{49}$$

Step 2: a priori estimate on $(m_{i,j}^n)$ Multiplying the second equation in (21) by $m_{i,j}^n$, summing with respect to the indices i and j and n, we get that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} \sum_{i,j} m_{i,j}^n \frac{m_{i,j}^{n+1} - m_{i,j}^n}{\Delta t} - \nu \sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} \|\nabla_h m^n\|_2^2 - \sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} \sum_{i,j} m_{i,j}^n g_q(x_{i,j}, [D_h u^{n+1}]_{i,j}) \cdot [D_h m^n]_{i,j} = 0. \tag{50}$$

In a very classical way, using the continuity of g_q and the a priori bound on $\|D_h u^{n+1}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}_h^2)}$ leads to the existence of a positive constant C such that

$$\max_n \|m^n\|_2^2 + \Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} \|[D_h m^n]\|_2^2 \le C \|m^{N_T}\|_2^2. \tag{51}$$

Remark 6 *From (21), we see that for all grid function* $(r_{i,j})$ *on* $\mathbb{T}_h$*,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} \sum_{i,j} r_{i,j}^n \frac{m_{i,j}^{n+1} - m_{i,j}^n}{\Delta t} \\ =&\nu \sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} \sum_{i,j} (\nabla_h m^n)_{i,j} \cdot (\nabla_h r^n)_{i,j} + \sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} \sum_{i,j} m_{i,j}^n g_q(x_{i,j}, [D_h u^{n+1}]_{i,j}) \cdot [D_h r^n]_{i,j}. \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

From the a priori bound on $\|D_h u^{n+1}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}_h^2)}$ *and (51), we infer that*

$$\sup_{(r^n)_n} \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} \sum_{i,j} r_{i,j}^n \frac{m_{i,j}^{n+1} - m_{i,j}^n}{\Delta t}}{\sqrt{\sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} \sum_{i,j} |[D_h r^n]_{i,j}|^2}} \le C.$$

Step 3 From (51), we see that the family of functions (m_h) is bounded in $L^2(0,T; H^1(\mathbb{T}^2))$. Moreover, from (52) and the a priori bound on $\|D_h u^{n+1}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}_h^2)}$, we can use the same arguments as in e.g. [7] pages 855-858 and prove that the family of functions (m_h) has the following property: there exists a constant C such that

$$\|m_h(\cdot - \tau, \cdot) - m_h(\cdot, \cdot)\|_{L^2((\tau,T)\times\mathbb{T}^2)}^2 \le C\tau h^2 \Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} \left(\sum_{i,j} |[D_h m^n]_{i,j}|^2 + \sum_{i,j} (m_{i,j}^n)^2 \right), \tag{53}$$

for all $\tau \in (0, T)$. Since the right hand side is bounded by $C\tau h^2 \|m^{N_T}\|_2^2$, Kolmogorov's theorem (see e.g. [4], [8], [7] page 833) implies that the family of functions (m_h) is relatively compact in $L^2((0,T) \times \mathbb{T}^2)$: we can extract a subsequence of parameters h and Δt tending to 0 such that

m_h converges to $\bar{m}$ strongly in $L^2((0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^2)$, and (53) holds for $\bar{m}$. Therefore, from (Φ_{h4}),

$$\lim_{h,\Delta t\to 0}\Delta t\sum_{n=0}^{N_T}\|\Phi[\bar{m}(t_n,\cdot)]-\Phi_h[m^n]\|^2_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}_h^2)}=0.$$

On the other hand, from (40), we see that

$$\Delta t\, h^2\sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1}\left(\Phi_h[m^n]-\Phi_h[\tilde{m}^n],m^n-\tilde{m}^n\right)_2=o(1).$$

Then, using (17), we deduce from the previous two formulas that

$$\lim_{\Delta t\to 0}\Delta t\sum_{n=0}^{N_T}\int_{\mathbb{T}_h^2}\left(\Phi[m(t_n,\cdot)](x)-\Phi[\bar{m}(t_n,\cdot)](x)\right)(m(t_n,x)-\bar{m}(t_n,x))dx=0,$$

which implies that

$$\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}_h^2}\left(\Phi[m(t,\cdot)](x)-\Phi[\bar{m}(t,\cdot)](x)\right)(m(t,x)-\bar{m}(t,x))dxdt=0,$$

The monotonicity of Φ then implies that $m=\bar{m}$. From the uniqueness of the limit $\bar{m}$, we have proven that the whole family m_h converges to m in $L^2((0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^2)$ as h and Δt tend to zero. We conclude as in Step 3 of the proof of Theorem 3 for the convergence of u_h to u in $\mathcal{C}^0[0,T]\times\mathbb{T}^2)$ and in $L^2(0,T;W^{1,2}(\mathbb{T}^2))$. ■

5 Study of the convergence in the case when Φ is a local operator

5.1 A priori estimates for (21)-(22) with local operators Φ_h

We have a result similar to Theorem 2.7 in [16]:

Lemma 6 *Assume that $0\le m_T(x)\le\bar{m}_T$ and that u_0 is a continuous function. If g is given by (10)-(11), $(\Phi_h[m])_{i,j}=F(m_{i,j})$, where*

(F_1) F is a $\mathcal{C}^0$ function defined on $[0,\infty)$

(F_2) there exist three constants $\delta>0$ and $\gamma>1$ and $C_1\ge 0$ such that

$$mF(m)\ge\delta|F(m)|^\gamma-C_1,\quad\forall m\ge 0,$$

then there exists two constants c and $C>0$ such that

- *$u_{i,j}^n\ge c$, for all n, i and j*
- $$h^2\Delta t\sum_{n=1}^{N_T}\sum_{i,j}\left|[D_hu^n]_{i,j}\right|^\beta+h^2\Delta t\sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1}\sum_{i,j}\left|F(m_{i,j}^n)\right|^\gamma\le C\tag{54}$$
- $$\max_{0\le n\le N_T}h^2\sum_{i,j}|u_{i,j}^n|\le C\tag{55}$$

- *Finally, let us call* U^n *the sum* $h^2\sum_{i,j} u^n_{i,j}$ *and* U_h *the piecewise linear function obtained by interpolating the values* U^n *at the points* (t_n)*: the family of functions* (U_h) *is bounded in* $W^{1,1}(0,T)$ *by a constant independent of* h *and* Δt*.*

Proof.

From the two assumptions on F, we deduce that $\underline{F} \equiv \inf_{m\in\mathbb{R}_+} F(m)$ is a real number and that $\underline{F} = \min_{m\geq 0} F(m)$. Note that $\underline{F} = F(0)$ if F is nondecreasing.
A standard comparison argument shows that

$$u^n_{i,j} \geq \min_{x\in\mathbb{T}^2} u^0(x) + \left(\underline{F} - \max_{x\in\mathbb{T}^2} \mathcal{H}(x)\right) t_n \geq \min_{x\in\mathbb{T}^2} u^0(x) - T\left(\underline{F} - \max_{x\in\mathbb{T}^2} \mathcal{H}(x)\right)^-,$$

so $u^n_{i,j}$ is bounded from below by a constant independent of h and Δt.
Consider $\tilde{u}^n_{i,j} = n\Delta t F(\bar{m}_T)$ and $\tilde{m}^n_{i,j} = \bar{m}_T$ for all i,j,n. We have

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\tilde{u}^{n+1}_{i,j}-\tilde{u}^n_{i,j}}{\Delta t} - \nu(\Delta_h \tilde{u}^{n+1})_{i,j} + g(x_{i,j},[D_h\tilde{u}^{n+1}]_{i,j}) & = F(\bar{m}_T) + \mathcal{H}(x_{i,j}),\\ \frac{\tilde{m}^{n+1}_{i,j}-\tilde{m}^n_{i,j}}{\Delta t} + \nu(\Delta_h \tilde{m}^n)_{i,j} + \mathcal{T}_{i,j}(\tilde{u}^{n+1},\tilde{m}^n) & = 0. \end{cases}$$

Identity (39) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &h^2\Delta t\mathcal{G}(m,u,\tilde{u}) + h^2\Delta t\mathcal{G}(\tilde{m},\tilde{u},u) + h^2\Delta t\sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1}\sum_{i,j}(F(m^n_{i,j}) - F(\bar{m}_T)(m^n_{i,j}-\bar{m}_T)\\ =&h^2\Delta t\sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1}\sum_{i,j}\mathcal{H}(x_{i,j})(m^n_{i,j}-\tilde{m}^n_{i,j}) + h^2(m^{N_T}-\bar{m}_T, u^{N_T} - T\,F(\bar{m}_T))_2 - h^2(m^0-\bar{m}_T,u^0)_2. \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

Note that

$$\mathcal{G}(m,u,\tilde{u}) = \mathcal{G}(m,u,0) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{G}(\tilde{m},\tilde{u},u) = \mathcal{G}(\tilde{m},0,u),$$

because $\tilde{u}^n_{i,j}$ does not depend on i,j. On the other hand,

1. Since the function $\mathcal{H}$ is bounded, and m^n is a discrete probability density, there exists a constant C such that

$$\left| h^2\Delta t\sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1}\sum_{i,j}\mathcal{H}(x_{i,j})(m^n_{i,j}-\tilde{m}^n_{i,j})\right| \leq C.$$

2. Since $m^{N_T}-\bar{m}_T$ is nonpositive with a bounded mass, and since u^n is bounded from below by a constant, there exists a constant C such that

$$h^2(m^{N_T}-\bar{m}_T, u^{N_T} - T\,F(\bar{m}_T))_2 \leq C.$$

3. Since u_0 is continuous on $\mathbb{T}^2$ and m_0 is a discrete probability density, there exists a constant C such that

$$-h^2(m^0-\bar{m}_T,u^0)_2 \leq C.$$

4. Finally, we know that

$$(F(m^n_{i,j}) - F(\bar m_T))(m^n_{i,j} - \bar m_T) \geq \delta \left|F(m^n_{i,j}\right|^\gamma - C_1 - \bar m_T F(m^n_{i,j}) - m^n_{i,j} F(\bar m_T) + \bar m_T F(\bar m_T).$$

Moreover, since $\gamma > 1$, there exists two constants $c = \frac{\delta}{2}$ and C such that $\delta \left|F(m^n_{i,j})\right|^\gamma - \bar m_T F(m^n_{i,j}) \geq c \left|F(m^n_{i,j})\right|^\gamma - C$. Since $m^n \in \mathcal{K}_h$, summing yields that for a possibly different constant C,

$$h^2 \sum_{i,j} (F(m^n_{i,j}) - F(\bar m_T))(m^n_{i,j} - \bar m_T) \geq c h^2 \sum_{i,j} \left|F(m^n_{i,j})\right|^\gamma - C.$$

In the case $\beta \geq 2$, we get (54) from (56), from (35) and from the four points above. In the case $1 < \beta < 2$, we get (54) from (56), from Remark 4 and from the four points above.
Finally, summing the first equation in (21) for all i, j, $0 \leq \ell < n$ one gets that

$$h^2 \sum_{i,j} u^n_{i,j} + h^2 \Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{q-1} \sum_{i,j} g(x_{i,j}, [D_h u^{\ell+1}]_{i,j}) = h^2 \Delta t \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-1} \sum_{i,j} F(m^\ell_{i,j}) + h^2 \sum_{i,j} u^0_{i,j}.$$

Using (54), we get that there exists a constant C such that

$$h^2 \sum_{i,j} u^n_{i,j} \leq C,$$

and since $u^n_{i,j}$ is bounded from below by a constant, we get (55).
Finally, remember that U^n is the sum $h^2 \sum_{i,j} u^n_{i,j}$; summing the first equations in (21) for all i, j, we obtain that

$$\frac{U^{n+1} - U^n}{\Delta t} = G^{n+1} \equiv -h^2 \sum_{i,j} \left(g(x_{i,j}, [D_h u^{n+1}]_{i,j}) + F(m^n_{i,j}) \right).$$

The a priori estimate (54) implies that $\Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{N_T=1} |G^{n+1}|$ is bounded by a constant. This implies that the piecewise linear function U_h obtained by interpolating the values U^n at the points (t_n) is bounded in $W^{1,1}(0,T)$ by a constant independent of h and Δt. ■

5.2 Convergence theorems

The case when Φ is a local operator, i.e. $\Phi[m](x) = F(m(x))$ brings additional difficulties, because there is no a priori Lipschitz estimates on u_h: such estimates were used several times in the proofs of Theorems 3 and 4.
For simplicity, we are going to make the assumption that the continuous problem has a classical solution: existence of a classical solution can be true for local operators Φ: for example, it has been proved in [6] that if $\beta = 2$, and F is $\mathcal{C}^1$ and bounded from below, and if the functions u^0 and m_T are $\mathcal{C}^2$ then there is a classical solution.

Remark 7 *In the case of the stationary problem (4), it can be proved that, if (F_2) holds with $\gamma > 2$ (2 is the space dimension) and F is nondecreasing, then (4) has a classical solution for any $\beta > 1$, by using the weak Bernstein method studied in [17].*

Standing assumptions (in § 5.2)

- We take $\nu > 0$
- The Hamiltonian is of the form (7) and the function $x \to \mathcal{H}(x)$ is $\mathcal{C}^1$ on $\mathbb{T}^2$
- the functions u^0 and m_T are smooth, and $m_T \in \mathcal{K}$ is bounded from below by a positive number
- We assume that (F_1) and (F_2) hold that there exists three positive constants $\underline{\delta}$, $\eta_1 > 0$ and $0 < \eta_2 < 1$ such that $F'(m) \geq \underline{\delta} \min(m^{\eta_1}, m^{-\eta_2})$
- We consider a numerical Hamiltonian given by (10)-(11)

Theorem 5 *We make the standing assumptions stated above and we assume furthermore that there is unique classical solution (u, m) of (1)-(3) such that $m > 0$.*

Let u_h (resp. m_h) be the piecewise trilinear function in $\mathcal{C}([0,T]\times\mathbb{T}^2)$ obtained by interpolating the values $u^n_{i,j}$ (resp $m^n_{i,j}$) at the nodes of the space-time grid. The functions u_h converge in $L^\beta(0,T;W^{1,\beta}(\mathbb{T}^2))$ to u as h and Δt tend to 0. The functions m_h converge to m in $L^{2-\eta_2}((0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^2)$ as h and Δt tend to 0.

Proof. Call $\bar{m} = \max m(t,x)$ and $0 < \underline{m} = \min m(t,x)$.

Step 1 We start from (40) where a and b are the same consistency errors (with the same bounds) as in § 4. From Lemma 6, the a priori bound (55) holds for u_h. This implies that $\lim_{h,\Delta t\to 0} h^2 \max_n |(b^{n-1}, u^n - \tilde{u}^n)_2| = 0$. From the fact that $m^n \in \mathcal{K}_h$, we also get that $\lim_{h,\Delta t\to 0} h^2 \max_n |(a^n, m^n - \tilde{m}^n)_2| = 0$.
Therefore, if $\beta \geq 2$, we obtain (41) and (42).
If $1 < \beta < 2$, we are going to prove that (42) also holds: we have

$$2^{\beta-3}\beta(\beta-1)\Delta t\, h^2 \sum_{\ell=0}^{N_T-1}\sum_{i,j} \tilde{m}^\ell_{i,j} 1_{p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}+\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}\neq 0} \min\left(|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2}_\infty, |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2}_\infty\right) |p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^2 = o(1).$$

where $p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}, \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j} \in (\mathbb{R}_+)^4$ are given by (34). Let us define for brevity

$$V^{\ell+1}_{i,j} = 2^{\beta-3}\beta(\beta-1) 1_{p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}+\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}\neq 0} \min\left(|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2}_\infty, |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2}_\infty\right) |p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^2.$$

Assume that $\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j} \neq 0$. We have

$$V^{\ell+1}_{i,j} \geq 2^{\beta-3}\beta(\beta-1)\min(|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2}, |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2})|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^2.$$

- If $|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}| \leq |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|$, then

$$V^{\ell+1}_{i,j} \geq 2^{\beta-3}\beta(\beta-1)|\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2}|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^2.$$

- If $|\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}| \leq |p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|$ and $|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}| \leq |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|/2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} V^{\ell+1}_{i,j} &\geq 2^{\beta-3}\beta(\beta-1)|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2}|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^2 \\ &\geq 2^{\beta-3}\beta(\beta-1)(3|\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|/2)^{\beta-2}|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^2 \\ &= \frac{3^{\beta-2}}{2}\beta(\beta-1)|\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2}|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^2. \end{aligned}$$

- If $|\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}| \le |p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|$ and $|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}| \ge |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|/2$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
V^{\ell+1}_{i,j} &\ge 2^{\beta-3}\beta(\beta-1)|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2}|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^2 \\
&\ge 2^{\beta-3}\beta(\beta-1)(|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}| + |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|)^{\beta-2}|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^2 \\
&\ge 2^{\beta-3}\beta(\beta-1)(3|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|)^{\beta-2}|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^2 \\
&= \frac{6^{\beta-2}}{2}\beta(\beta-1)|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j} = 0$ and $p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} \neq 0$, then $V^{\ell+1}_{i,j} \ge 2^{\beta-3}\beta(\beta-1)|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta}$.
From the observation above, and since $\tilde{m}^{\ell}_{i,j} \ge \underline{m}$,

$$\Delta t\, h^2 \sum_{\ell=0}^{N_T-1} \sum_{i,j} \left(\begin{array}{l}
1_{\{|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}| \le |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|\}} |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2} |p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^2 \\
+1_{\{|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}| \ge |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|\}} 1_{\{|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}| \le |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|/2\}} |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2} |p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^2 \\
+1_{\{|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}| \ge |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|\}} 1_{\{|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}| \ge |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|/2\}} |p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta}.
\end{array} \right) = o(1).$$

Note also that from the regularity of u, $|\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta-2}$ is bounded from below by a constant independent of h, Δt, i, j, ℓ. Thus

$$\Delta t\, h^2 \sum_{\ell=0}^{N_T-1} \sum_{i,j} \left(\begin{array}{l}
1_{\{|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}| \le |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|\}} |p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^2 \\
+1_{\{|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}| \ge |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|\}} 1_{\{|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}| \le |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|/2\}} |p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^2 \\
+1_{\{|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j}| \ge |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|\}} 1_{\{|p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}| \ge |\tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|/2\}} |p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j}|^{\beta}.
\end{array} \right) = o(1).$$

Using a Hölder inequality, we deduce that

$$h^2 \Delta t \sum_{\ell=1}^{N_T} \sum_{i,j} \left| p^{\ell+1}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}^{\ell+1}_{i,j} \right|^{\beta} = o(1),$$

and finally (42).

Step 2 We also obtain from (40) that

$$h^2 \Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} \sum_{i,j} (F(m^n_{i,j}) - F(\tilde{m}^n_{i,j})(m^n_{i,j} - \tilde{m}^n_{i,j}) = o(1). \tag{57}$$

We split the sum w.r.t. (i, j) in the left hand side of (57) into

$$\begin{aligned}
S^n_1 &= \sum_{i,j} ((m^n_{i,j} - \tilde{m}^n_{i,j})^-)^2 \int_0^1 F'(\tilde{m}^n_{i,j} + t(m^n_{i,j} - \tilde{m}^n_{i,j}))dt, \\
S^n_2 &= \sum_{n=0}^{N_T-1} \sum_{i,j} ((m^n_{i,j} - \tilde{m}^n_{i,j})^+)^2 \int_0^1 F'(\tilde{m}^n_{i,j} + t(m^n_{i,j} - \tilde{m}^n_{i,j}))dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Call $\bar{m} = \max m(t,x)$ and $\underline{m} = \min m(t,x) > 0$; there exists a positive number c depending on $\underline{m}$ and $\bar{m}$ but independent of h and δ, and (i,j,n) such that

$$\begin{aligned}
S_1^n &\geq c \sum_{i,j} ((m_{i,j}^n - \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n)^-)^2 \int_0^1 (\tilde{m}_{i,j}^n + t(m_{i,j}^n - \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n))^{\eta_1} dt \\
&= \frac{c}{\eta_1 + 1} \sum_{i,j} ((m_{i,j}^n - \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n)^-)((\tilde{m}_{i,j}^n)^{\eta_1+1} - (m_{i,j}^n)^{\eta_1+1}) \\
&\geq \frac{c}{\eta_1 + 1} \sum_{i,j} ((m_{i,j}^n - \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n)^-)^2 (\tilde{m}_{i,j}^n)^{\eta_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

The latter inequality comes from the nondecreasing character of the function $\chi : [0,y] \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, $\chi(z) = \frac{y^{\eta_1+1} - z^{\eta_1+1}}{y-z}$. Thus, $\chi(z) \geq \chi(0) = y^{\eta_1}$. Hence, there exists a constant c depending on the bounds on the density m solution of (1)-(3) but not on h and Δt, and (i,j,n) such that

$$S_1^n \geq c \sum_{i,j} ((m_{i,j}^n - \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n)^-)^2.$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned}
S_2^n &\geq c \sum_{i,j} ((m_{i,j}^n - \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n)^+)^2 \int_0^1 (\tilde{m}_{i,j}^n + t(m_{i,j}^n - \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n))^{-\eta_2} dt \\
&= \frac{c}{1 - \eta_2} \sum_{i,j} ((m_{i,j}^n - \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n)^+)((m_{i,j}^n)^{1-\eta_2} - (\tilde{m}_{i,j}^n)^{1-\eta_2}) \\
&\geq c \sum_{i,j} ((m_{i,j}^n - \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n)^+)^2 (m_{i,j}^n)^{-\eta_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

But there exists a constant c such that for all $y \in [\underline{m}, \bar{m}]$: if $z \geq y + 1$

$$(z-y)^2 z^{-\eta_2} \geq (z-y)^{2-\eta_2} \inf_{z \geq y+1} \frac{(z-y)^{\eta_2}}{z^{\eta_2}} \geq c(z-y)^{2-\eta_2},$$

and if $y \leq z \leq y + 1$,

$$(z-y)^2 z^{-\eta_2} \geq c(z-y)^2.$$

Therefore there exists a constant c such that

$$S_1^n + S_2^n \geq c \left(\sum_{i,j} (m_{i,j}^n - \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n)^2 1_{\{m_{i,j}^n \leq \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n + 1\}} + \sum_{i,j} (m_{i,j}^n - \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n)^{2-\eta_2} 1_{\{m_{i,j}^n \geq \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n + 1\}} \right).$$

Then (57) implies that

$$\lim_{h,\Delta t \to 0} h^2 \Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{N_T - 1} \left(\sum_{i,j} (m_{i,j}^n - \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n)^2 1_{\{m_{i,j}^n \leq \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n + 1\}} + \sum_{i,j} (m_{i,j}^n - \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n)^{2-\eta_2} 1_{\{m_{i,j}^n \geq \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n + 1\}} \right) = 0.$$

Then, a Hölder inequality leads to

$$\lim_{h,\Delta t \to 0} h^2 \Delta t \sum_{n=0}^{N_T - 1} \sum_{i,j} |m_{i,j}^n - \tilde{m}_{i,j}^n|^{2-\eta_2} = 0.$$

Step 3 From the previous two steps, up to an extraction of a sequence, $m_h \to m$ in $L^{2-\eta_2}((0,T)\times \mathbb{T}^2)$ and almost everywhere in $(0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^2$, ∇u_h converges to ∇u strongly in $L^\beta((0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^2)$. Moreover, from the last point in Lemma 6, the sequence of piecewise linear functions (U_h) on $[0,T]$ obtained by interpolating the values $U^n = h^2\sum_{i,j} u^n_{i,j}$ at the points (t_n) is bounded in $W^{1,1}(0,T)$, so up to a further extraction of a subsequence, it converges to some function U in $L^\beta(0,T)$. As a result, there exists a function ψ of the variable t such that $u_h \to u+\psi$ in $L^\beta(0,T;W^{1,\beta}(\mathbb{T}^2))$.

From the a priori estimate (54), the sequence $(F(m_h))$ is bounded in $L^\gamma((0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^2)$ for some $\gamma>0$, which implies that it is uniformly integrable on $(0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^2$. On the other hand, $F(m_h)$ converges almost everywhere to $F(m)$. Therefore, from Vitali's theorem, see e.g. [19] , $F(m_h)$ converges to $F(m)$ in $L^1((0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^2)$, (in fact, it is also possible to show that $F(m_h)$ converges to $F(m)$ in $L^q((0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^2)$ for all $q\in[1,\gamma)$).

It is then possible to pass to the limit in the discrete Bellman equation, which yields that $\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t}=0$ in the sense of distributions in $(0,T)$. Hence ψ is a constant.

We are left with proving that ψ is indeed 0. For that, we split $\frac{\partial u_h}{\partial t}$ into the sum $\mu_h+\eta_h$, where

- $\mu_h|_{t\in(t_n,t_{n+1}]}$ is constant w.r.t. t and piecewise linear w.r.t. x, and takes the value $\nu(\Delta_h u^{n+1})_{i,j}$ at the node $\xi_{i,j}$
- η_h is the remainder, see (18). This term is constructed by interpolating the values $F(m^n_{i,j}) - g(x_{i,j},[D_h u^{n+1}]_{i,j})$ at the grid nodes.

From the observations above, (η_h) converges in $L^1((0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^2)$, (because of the strong convergence of ∇u_h and of $F(m_h)$). On the other hand, from (42), it is not difficult to see that (μ_h) is a Cauchy sequence in $L^\beta(0,T;(W^{s,\beta/(\beta-1)}(\mathbb{T}^2))')$ for s large enough, (here $(W^{s,\beta/(\beta-1)}(\mathbb{T}^2))'$ is the topological dual of $W^{s,\beta/(\beta-1)}(\mathbb{T}^2)$). Hence, $(\frac{\partial u_h}{\partial t})$ converges in $L^1(0,T;(W^{s,\beta/(\beta-1)}(\mathbb{T}^2))')$. Therefore, u_h converges in $\mathcal{C}^0([0,T];(W^{s,\beta/(\beta-1)}(\mathbb{T}^2))')$; since $(u_h(t=0))$ converges to u_0, we see that $\psi=0$.

This implies that the extracted sequence u_h converges to u in $L^\beta(0,T;W^{1,\beta}(\mathbb{T}^2))$. Since the limit is unique, the whole family (u_h) converges to u in $L^\beta(0,T;W^{1,\beta}(\mathbb{T}^2))$ as h and Δt tend to 0. ■

We give the corresponding theorem in the ergodic case, without proof, because it is quite similar to that of Theorem 5.

Theorem 6 *We make the standing assumptions stated at the beginning of* § *5.2 and we assume furthermore that there is unique classical solution* (u,m,λ) *of (4)-(5) such that* $m>0$ *and* $\int_{\mathbb{T}^2} u(x)dx = 0$.

Let u_h *(resp.* m_h*) be the piecewise bilinear function in* $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ *obtained by interpolating the values* $u_{i,j}$ *(resp* $m_{i,j}$*) at the nodes of* $\mathbb{T}^2_h$*, where* $((u_{i,j}),(m_{i,j}),\lambda_h)$ *is the unique solution of the following system:*

for all $0\le i,j<N_h$, $m_{i,j}\ge 0$,

$$\begin{cases} -\nu(\Delta_h u)_{i,j} + g(x_{i,j},[D_h u]_{i,j}) + \lambda_h &= F(m_{i,j}),\\ -\nu(\Delta_h m)_{i,j} - \mathcal{T}_{i,j}(u,m) &= 0,\\ h^2\sum_{i,j} u_{i,j} = 0, \quad h^2\sum_{i,j} m_{i,j} &= 1. \end{cases} \tag{58}$$

As h *tends to* 0*, the functions* u_h *converge in* $W^{1,\beta}(\mathbb{T}^2)$ *to* u*, the functions* m_h *converge to* m *in* $L^{2-\eta_2}(\mathbb{T}^2)$*, and* λ_h *tends to* λ.

A Proofs of some technical lemmas

Proof of Lemma 2 For all $r \in \mathbb{R}^4$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_q(x,q)\cdot r &= G_p(p)\cdot(-1_{q_1<0}r_1, 1_{q_2>0}r_2, -1_{q_3<0}r_3, 1_{q_4>0}r_4) \\ &= \beta|p|^{\beta-2}\left(-p_1r_1+p_2r_2-p_3r_3+p_4r_4\right) \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} -g_q(x,q)\cdot(\tilde q-q) &= -G_p(p)\cdot\Big(-1_{q_1<0}(\tilde q_1-q_1), 1_{q_2>0}(\tilde q_2-q_2), -1_{q_3<0}(\tilde q_3-q_3), 1_{q_4>0}(\tilde q_4-q_4)\Big) \\ &= -\beta|p|^{\beta-2}\Big(-p_1(\tilde q_1-q_1)+p_2(\tilde q_2-q_2)-p_3(\tilde q_3-q_3)+p_4(\tilde q_4-q_4)\Big). \end{aligned}$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} -p_1(\tilde q_1-q_1) &= p_1(\tilde p_1-p_1)-p_1\tilde q_1^+ \le p_1(\tilde p_1-p_1), \\ p_2(\tilde q_2-q_2) &= p_2(\tilde p_2-p_2)-p_2\tilde q_2^- \le p_2(\tilde p_2-p_2), \\ -p_3(\tilde q_3-q_3) &= p_3(\tilde p_3-p_3)-p_3\tilde q_3^+ \le p_3(\tilde p_3-p_3), \\ p_4(\tilde q_4-q_4) &= p_4(\tilde p_4-p_4)-p_4\tilde q_4^- \le p_4(\tilde p_4-p_4). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$-g_q(x,q)\cdot(\tilde q-q) \ge -\beta|p|^{\beta-2}p\cdot(\tilde p-p) = -G_p(p)\cdot(\tilde p-p), \tag{59}$$

and (27) follows immediately.

Proof of Lemma 3 If $\beta \ge 2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} g(x,\tilde q)-g(x,q)-g_q(x,q)\cdot(\tilde q-q) &\ge G(\tilde p)-G(p)-G_p(p)\cdot(\tilde p-p) \\ &= \int_0^1 (1-s)G_{pp}(s\tilde p+(1-s)p)(\tilde p-p)\cdot(\tilde p-p)ds \\ &\ge \beta|p-\tilde p|^2\int_0^1(1-s)|s\tilde p+(1-s)p|^{\beta-2}ds, \end{aligned}$$

where the first (resp. second) inequality comes from Lemma 2 (resp. Lemma 1). Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} g(x,\tilde q)-g(x,q)-g_q(x,q)\cdot(\tilde q-q) &\ge \beta|p|^{\beta-2}|p-\tilde p|^2\int_0^1(1-s)^{\beta-1}ds \\ &= |p|^{\beta-2}|p-\tilde p|^2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} g(x,\tilde q)-g(x,q)-g_q(x,q)\cdot(\tilde q-q) &\ge \beta|\tilde p|^{\beta-2}|p-\tilde p|^2\int_0^1(1-s)s^{\beta-2}ds \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta-1}|\tilde p|^{\beta-2}|p-\tilde p|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The last two estimates yield (28) because $1 \ge \frac{1}{\beta-1}$, then (29).

If $1<\beta<2$ and $p+\tilde p \neq 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} g(x,\tilde q)-g(x,q)-g_q(x,q)\cdot(\tilde q-q) &\ge \int_0^1(1-s)G_{pp}(s\tilde p+(1-s)p)(\tilde p-p)\cdot(\tilde p-p)ds \\ &\ge \beta(\beta-1)|p-\tilde p|^2\int_0^1(1-s)|s\tilde p+(1-s)p|^{\beta-2}ds, \end{aligned}$$

where the first (resp. second) inequality comes from Lemma 2 (resp. Lemma 1). But $|s\tilde{p}+(1-s)p| \leq 2\max(|p|_\infty, |\tilde{p}|_\infty)$ and since $\beta<2$, $|s\tilde{p}+(1-s)p|^{\beta-2} \geq 2^{\beta-2}\min(|p|_\infty^{\beta-2}, |\tilde{p}|_\infty^{\beta-2})$. Hence,

$$g(x,\tilde{q})-g(x,q)-g_q(x,q)\cdot(\tilde{q}-q) \geq 2^{\beta-2}\beta(\beta-1)\min(|p|_\infty^{\beta-2}, |\tilde{p}|_\infty^{\beta-2})\int_0^1 (1-s)ds,$$

which yields (30).

Proof of Lemma 4 We have that

$$\begin{aligned} &(g_q(x,\tilde{q})-g_q(x,q))\cdot r \\ =&\beta\Big(|\tilde{p}|^{\beta-2}\left(-\tilde{p}_1r_1+\tilde{p}_2r_2-\tilde{p}_3r_3+\tilde{p}_4r_4\right)-|p|^{\beta-2}\left(-p_1r_1+p_2r_2-p_3r_3+p_4r_4\right)\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Call ℓ the function defined on $(\mathbb{R}_+)^4$ by

$$\ell(p)=\beta|p|^{\beta-2}p\cdot \mathrm{Diag}(-1,1,-1,1)r,$$

where $\mathrm{Diag}(-1,1,-1,1)$ stands for the diagonal matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{4\times 4}$ whose diagonal is $(-1,1,-1,1)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &(g_q(x,\tilde{q})-g_q(x,q))\cdot r=\ell(\tilde{p})-\ell(p)=\int_0^1 \ell_p(s\tilde{p}+(1-s)p)\cdot(\tilde{p}-p)ds, &&\text{if } p+\tilde{p}\neq 0,\\ &(g_q(x,\tilde{q})-g_q(x,q))\cdot r=0, &&\text{if } p+\tilde{p}=0. \end{aligned}$$

But

$$\ell_p(p)=\beta(\beta-2)|p|^{\beta-4}\left(p\cdot \mathrm{Diag}(-1,1,-1,1)r\right)p+\beta|p|^{\beta-2}\mathrm{Diag}(-1,1,-1,1)r, \quad \forall p\neq 0.$$

Hence, if $p+\tilde{p}\neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &(g_q(x,\tilde{q})-g_q(x,q))\cdot r\\ =\;&\beta(\beta-2)\int_0^1 |s\tilde{p}+(1-s)p|^{\beta-4}\Big((s\tilde{p}+(1-s)p)\cdot \mathrm{Diag}(-1,1,-1,1)r\Big)\Big((s\tilde{p}+(1-s)p)\cdot(\tilde{p}-p)\Big)ds\\ &+\beta\int_0^1 |s\tilde{p}+(1-s)p|^{\beta-2}\Big((\tilde{p}-p)\cdot \mathrm{Diag}(-1,1,-1,1)r\Big)ds. \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

Call I (respectively II) the first (respectively second) integral in (60). It is clear that

$$|I| \leq |p-\tilde{p}||r|\int_0^1 |s\tilde{p}+(1-s)p|^{\beta-2}ds \leq \max(|p|^{\beta-2}, |\tilde{p}|^{\beta-2})|p-\tilde{p}||r|.$$

We also have

$$|II| \leq \max(|p|^{\beta-2}, |\tilde{p}|^{\beta-2})|p-\tilde{p}||r|,$$

and (31) follows from the last two estimates.

Acknowledgement 1 *The first author would like to thank O. Guéant for helpful discussions.*

References

[1] Y. Achdou, F. Camilli, and I. Capuzzo Dolcetta. Mean field games: numerical methods for the planning problem. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 50(1):77–109, 2012.

[2] Y. Achdou and I. Capuzzo-Dolcetta. Mean field games: numerical methods. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 48(3):1136–1162, 2010.

[3] Y. Achdou and V. Perez. Iterative strategies for solving linearized discrete mean field games. *Networks and heterogeneous media*, 7(2):197–217, 2012.

[4] H. Brezis. *Analyse fonctionnelle*. Collection Mathématiques Appliquées pour la Maîtrise. [Collection of Applied Mathematics for the Master's Degree]. Masson, Paris, 1983. Théorie et applications. [Theory and applications].

[5] F. Camilli and F.J. Silva. A semi-discrete approximation for a first order mean field games problem. *Networks and heterogeneous media*, 2012.

[6] P. Cardaliaguet, , J-M. Lasry, P-L. Lions, and A. Porretta. Long time average of mean field games. *Networks and heterogeneous media*, 7(2):279–301, 2012.

[7] R. Eymard, T. Gallouët, and R. Herbin. Finite volume methods. In *Handbook of numerical analysis, Vol. VII*, Handb. Numer. Anal., VII, pages 713–1020. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2000.

[8] R. Eymard, T. Gallouët, D. Hilhorst, and Y. Naït Slimane. Finite volumes and nonlinear diffusion equations. *RAIRO Modél. Math. Anal. Numér.*, 32(6):747–761, 1998.

[9] D. A. Gomes, J. Mohr, and R. R. Souza. Discrete time, finite state space mean field games. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 93(3):308–328, 2010.

[10] O. Guéant. Mean field games equations with quadratic hamiltonian: a specific approach. arXiv:1106.3269v1, 2011.

[11] O. Guéant. New numerical methods for mean field games with quadratic costs. *Networks and heterogeneous media*, 7(2):315–336, 2012.

[12] O. Guéant, J-M. Lasry, and P-L. Lions. Mean field games and applications. In *Paris-Princeton Lectures on Mathematical Finance 2010*, volume 2003 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 205–266. Springer, Berlin, 2011.

[13] A. Lachapelle, J. Salomon, and G. Turinici. Computation of mean field equilibria in economics. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 20(4):567–588, 2010.

[14] J-M. Lasry and P-L. Lions. Jeux à champ moyen. I. Le cas stationnaire. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 343(9):619–625, 2006.

[15] J-M. Lasry and P-L. Lions. Jeux à champ moyen. II. Horizon fini et contrôle optimal. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 343(10):679–684, 2006.

[16] J-M. Lasry and P-L. Lions. Mean field games. *Jpn. J. Math.*, 2(1):229–260, 2007.

[17] P.-L. Lions. Quelques remarques sur les problèmes elliptiques quasilinéaires du second ordre. *J. Analyse Math.*, 45:234–254, 1985.

[18] P-L. Lions. Cours du Collège de France. http://www.college-de-france.fr/default/EN/all/equ_der/, 2007-2011.

[19] W Rudin. *Real and complex analysis. 3rd ed.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill. xiv, 416 p. $ 44.95 , 1987.